

**MINUTES OF THE THEBERTON AND EASTBRIDGE PARISH COUNCIL VIRTUAL MEETING
HELD VIA ZOOM MEETINGS ON WEDNESDAY 9th DECEMBER 2020 AT 7:00 PM**

1. Attendance and Apologies

Attendees:

Cllr. Stephen Brett - Chair
Cllr. Hilary Ward - Vice Chair
Cllr. Stephen Morphey
Cllr. Philip Baskett
Cllr. Graham Bickers
Cllr. Beth Goose
Cllr. Nat Bacon
Cllr. Paul Collins

Apologies for absence:

Cllr. Julian Wallis
District Cllr. Terry-Jill Haworth-Culf

In attendance:

County Cllr. Richard Smith
District Cllr. Jocelyn Bond
Sharon Smith - Clerk/RFO
Tom McGarry – EDF Energy
James Hansen – EDF Energy
Stephen Roast – EDF Energy
Alan Lewis – EDF Energy
Richard Jones – EDF Energy
Richard Bull – EDF Energy
Lidia Bosa – EDF Energy
14 members of the public

2. Declarations of Pecuniary and Non-Pecuniary Interests

None.

3. Public Forum

- a) County Cllr. Richard Smith said his report would be brief as many people were present to hear from EDF Energy. He has been asking all his Parish Councils for their opinion on the Sizewell C consultation as he would like to echo these views in his own response and he is therefore in listening mode tonight.
- b) District Cllr. Jocelyn Bond said she was dealing with planning matters on the Council's behalf but she has yet to receive any feedback. She said she is also interested to hear what EDF Energy and the parishioners had to say this evening.
- c) Tom McGarry, EDF's Head of Stakeholder Engagement for Sizewell C, thanked the Council for inviting him and his team to the meeting. Mr McGarry summarised the process which led to the submission of the DCO application. Since its submission there has been ongoing consultations with Local Authorities, statutory consultees and internally. The EDF team has grown, lessons have been learned from the Hinkley Point C development and feedback has been received from Town and Parish Councils and residents about the modal split of road, rail and sea. This led EDF to realise that it had to go much further, therefore it engaged civil engineers with expertise and challenged them to come up with proposals to flip the modal split. These proposals are detailed in the fifth round of public consultation, along with some other changes, which will inform EDF's proposals to be formally submitted to the Planning Inspectorate for examination. Mr McGarry introduced the EDF members present and, with the aid of presentation slides, summarised the proposals in the consultation. He then invited questions from the Council and the members of public present.

The following questions were asked and responses received:

Pretty Road

Question: (Cllr. Hilary Ward)

- Blocking road prevents easy route to Leiston and Saxmundham.
- What route are residents expected to take?
- Passage is required over or under the new by-pass to provide a safe route.
- Otherwise will have to join a 60 mph by-pass and turning right will present great difficulty.
- Or will need to negotiate the site entrance roundabout.

Response: (Richard Bull)

- Understand this is a major scheme traversing the landscape.
- Will impact many people and the routes they take.
- The design ensures there are exits at each end of the village.
- Concerns are understood and justifiable.
- Scheme will need people to adjust their behaviours.
- Road will be designed to ensure adequate visibility at the junctions.
- It is a trade-off between having a quieter B1122.

D2/W Route

Question: (Cllr. Hilary Ward)

- Is the D2 route still being considered?

Response: (Richard Bull)

- It is not part of our proposals.

Response: (Tom McGarry)

- Only the changes in the presentation are being consulted on.
- Everything in the DCO submission remains and will be taken forward for examination.
- Any critique of the proposals in the DCO need to be raised with the Planning Inspectorate.

Question: (Cllr. Nat Bacon)

- Strong feeling in the area that we have not had any sound justification about the decision to choose Route Z, the Sizewell Link Road, rather than Route W.
- You need to consider this before going forward to the Examination stage.

Response: (Richard Bull)

- A fair challenge which I am sure will be aired at the Examination stage in some detail.
- Clearly an important issue in the local area.
- These decisions are based on a planning judgement and the Examiner will consider whether we have made the right judgement based on the evidence put before them.
- Part of the evidence will be all the Representations submitted which will robustly reviewed.

Question: (John Rea Price)

- I am sure you are familiar with the pledges EDF has circulated recently and widely.
- Pledge number one is to minimise disruption to local communities.
- You have no appreciation of how serious the closure of Pretty Road will be.
- This is an essential route to access crucial medical services in Leiston and Saxmundham.
- 80% of the population is over 70 and in Theberton it will only be slightly less.

- If you can put in a bridge, which is in fact a bridleway, then why can you not put in a traffic bearing bridge?

Response: (Richard Bull)

- We understand your point and will consider it but it is not in our proposals at present.

Land Take

Question: (Cllr. Philip Baskett)

- If there are to be less HGVs, why do you need to take more land?

Response: (Richard Bull)

- We are still working with Network Rail.
- We are still developing the options for marine deliveries.
- The scenario taken forward will depend upon the outcome.
- The Sizewell Link Road is necessary to reduce the impact to the communities along the B1122 and Yoxford.
- That proposal will not be coming out whatever the solutions are on the final HGV number.

Question: (Cllr. Phillip Baskett)

- You claim to be environmentally aware.
- I have repeatedly asked you to leave my woodland and take more of my field.
- Every time a new map is issued you take more woodland.
- Why can't the road go left a bit?

Response: (Richard Bull)

- These are technical design issues,
- We are working on the detailed road design schemes with the County Council.
- Our transport consultant, WSP, will act as the interface between our land team, our stakeholders and the land owners impacted.
- We will have more informed dialogue and expertise on these issues going forward.

Sizewell Link Road

Question: (Cllr. Nat Bacon)

- The SLR will not be built during the first 2-3 years of construction.
- We cannot understand, with the SLR running so closely and sharing so many of the access points to the B1122, how it can be possible to build the SLR whilst the construction traffic is using the B1122?

Response: (Richard Bull)

- This is a good point.
- Our implementation plan needs to deliver the SLR very early in the construction phase.
- It needs to be done efficiently, quickly and constructed in a linear fashion.
- The larger vehicles will be in the confines of the order limits and working on the route.
- There will be a considerable amount of material that will be delivered to construct the road.
- The big challenge will be implementing this in an ordered fashion without causing mayhem.
- We will work with our contractors to ensure this can be done efficiently and without adding undue impacts to the local communities.

- It will undoubtedly be a challenge as the scale of the scheme is large.

Reply: (Cllr. Nat Bacon)

- I am sure it has occurred to you that this is another advancement that the D2/Route W can be quietly built during the early years of construction.
- The B1122 can absorb the traffic to allow for the construction of the other road.
- There would be a lot less chaos and it is a more workable solution.

Question: (Cllr. Graham Bickers)

- Framlingham has a population of 3,114 people with 25 roads with lighting and footpaths.
- Saxmundham has 3,500 people with 35 roads.
- Wickham Market has 2,500 people with 25 roads to dissipate population.
- Eastbridge and Theberton has only 7 roads with no footpaths and no street lights.
- Apart from the main B1122, 6 of those roads are narrow, single-track roads which at present drivers have to reverse up to 300m to allow safe passing.
- Without the use of vehicle recognition cameras explain how EDF intends to strictly control the movements of vehicles to and from the construction site given that the population of the accommodation block will be the equivalent size of Wickham Market?
- There is only one B road at the pinch point of the site entrance therefore if any of these minor roads are used this will cause significant problems to Eastbridge and Theberton.
- We have the significant impact of both the movement of HGVs and private vehicles.

Response: (Richard Bull)

- There will be controls as part of the management plans attached to the s.106 agreement once signed.
- We have the Workforce Travel Plan and the Construction Traffic Management Plan which will have required rules that will need to be adhered to.
- Clearly people who have their own cars - it's a free world and they can drive where they like but we need to have a very clear policy of what is permitted and what is not.
- We need to have a very clear signage strategy directing people to take the most appropriate route to the construction site.
- It is imperative that we have the right controls to ensure the workforce take the right routes to their point of work or residence and if they are taking their vehicles out socially.
- There needs to be a Code of Conduct that would minimise any impacts that you suggest might happen.
- I do not think it is likely that the lanes of Theberton and Eastbridge would become blocked with our cars but you have raised a valid point.

Reply: (Cllr. Graham Bickers)

- Why is that information not available now and why do you say that it's a free world?
- You have come to our community and have not considered us in that particular situation.
- All the roads leading to Eastbridge lead to nowhere.
- The highway finishes 300m past the Eel's Foot and becomes a private road which EDF should not be using.

Response: (Richard Bull)

- I assure you I was not being flippant when I said it was a free world.
- I am here trying to be receptive as possible and we will take away all these points raised.

- The specific management plans are being worked up in detail with all of our stakeholders and is part of the process.
- It is with the Local Authorities and the emergency services and they will be shared in due course once they are completed.
- We are happy to engage on those measures as they become clearer.
- Our extended delivery team has been mobilised and good discussions are being held with our team about, for example, how LGVs could be monitored in the same way as HGVs.

Response: (Tom McGarry)

- The management plans have to be discussed with the local communities and overseen by the Local Authorities.
- Putting management plans in for a project which we don't know whether will be approved is premature as there could be changes as a result of going through examination.

Response: (Lidia Bosa)

- I completely understand your concerns. I speak from experience having spent nearly 10 years on the Hinkley Point C project.
- Very strict measures are put in place for workers travelling across designated routes and parking is in allocated areas.
- We are grateful to residents who have advised us of any use of undesignated routes.
- They are given warning notices and if ignored then they are removed from the project.
- We have traffic management people on the road at all times monitoring vehicles.
- Everyone is included in this - including workers in private cars.
- We take this seriously and we want to work with the local community to accept this project.
- We will put up signs stating there is no access to the site and we will take vigilant action.

Question: (Simon Ilett)

- It is proposed that HGV deliveries will be reduced from 60% to 40%, on the back of a 30-50% increase in rail and a 10-30% increase in sea.
- That is a 20% variation. We are expected to give feedback on these wide ranging figures.
- If you have to go down to 30% rail because the trains cannot get in and you can only do 10% sea then we are back 60% HGVs anyway after you have asked for our views.
- When will we actually know what percentage will travel by road, rail and sea so that we can give an informed response?
- Our response will need to be based on the worst case scenario..

Response: (Richard Bull)

- The modal splits table given in the presentation is what we would like to do if there were no constraints on rail and no issues with weather and tides.
- We need to ensure that we get clarity that the capacity is available.
- With regards to rail, that depends on Network Rail and that is their capacity analysis at the moment.
- We are working with our design engineering team as to what capacity the BLF will have.
- At the planning examination, we need to be very clear about our proposals as they will be heavily scrutinised.
- Between now and the examination, we will take all the responses from this consultation and we will continue to work with our stakeholders to get more clarity on the designs and we will be very clear about what the capabilities are on each of those modes.

Question: (David Grant)

- Would you commit to removing the SLR at the completion of your project?
- This was part of previous consultations – what were the opinions you received?

Response: (Richard Bull)

- The proposal is to leave the road in place as legacy.
- Currently the District Council supports this but the County Council has a slightly different opinion.
- It will come under further scrutiny during the examination process.
- The opinions from the previous consultations were mixed.

Reply: (County Cllr. Richard Smith)

- Leaving the SLR as a legacy benefit is not the opinion of the County Council.
- The road needs to be taken up as it does not add anything to the present strategic road network.
- The Local Authorities have different opinions on Sizewell C but each is entitled to its own view.

Reply: (Cllr. Graham Bickers)

- It is in the financial interest of the District Council to support Sizewell C.

Question: (Cllr. Paul Collins)

- It is odd that EDF take the opinion of the District Council and not the County Council who are the Highways Authority.
- Why do you expect the Highways Authority to change the view of the District Council who don't have any say in the matter?

Response: (Tom McGarry)

- They do have a say in the matter. It is one opinion as is the County Council's.

Flooding

Question: (Cllr. Stephen Brett)

- You say flooding levels on the Eastbridge marshes might rise.
- Do you mean the marshes behind the Eel's Foot and towards Middleton?

Response: (James Hansen)

- There is quite a wide area that is naturally at risk of flooding.
- Fluvial flooding through Minsmere and the potential for coastal flooding overtopping or breaching the soft defences that exist on the coastline.
- We are not taking a property which is not at flood risk and creating a flood risk.
- Where we do see some change it will be in the order of a few millimetres but it depends on the flood event.
- We are looking at the flood risk throughout all phases of the project and beyond that to 2190 with all of the climate change allowances.
- There are naturally occurring events which go metres deep to which we are adding centimetres on top.
- Nonetheless it is an issue which we recognise and take seriously.
- Policy requires us to do everything we can do negate this but, if we can't, then to minimise it.

- It is driving two key changes in the consultation. We are creating a wider SSSI crossing to more closely mimic the natural flow of the Leiston Drain through that location by equalising the flow in the Sizewell SSSI and the south levels area of Minsmere.
- But it also has an effect in terms of coastal flooding which otherwise gets moved northwards towards Eastbridge.
- The flood mitigation area is there for that reason to take a volume of water which our site is displacing from that area.

Reply: (Cllr. Stephen Brett)

- The marshes in that area empty into the New Cut which, like the Leiston Drain, is in a bad state of repair because of Environment Agency policies.
- I accept that the marshes flood but they appear to be flooded for longer so if you could put pressure on the EA to dredge the New Cut that would help minimise the risk of flooding that you might cause.

Response: (James Hansen)

- We are exploring these issues and the need to find the right level of mitigation which is why we are looking at the options we put in the consultation.
- The management of this area is sensitive and a reason why dredging might not occur is integral with the management of the RSPB Minsmere Reserve which is reliant on water levels at a certain level.
- It might be that dredging solves one problem but creates another of an ecological nature.

Hard Coastal Defence

Question: (Cllr. Paul Collins)

- The defence will rise from 10.2 metres to 14 metres and then on to 15 metres. The sheet piles will be moved forward to allow for work behind them which was not previously planned.
- The depth of the hard coastal defence toe is only at AOD initially and when you adapt it further it goes down further.
- It is not clear how much further although both of them will be considerably further eastwards and into the dunes and the beach than you were planning in your DCO application.
- There are no maps or indications in this round of consultation just as there were none in the fourth round. They are just sketches and they are misleading.
- How deep does the hard coastal defence go and how much further forward is it compared with previously stated?
- Also, will the current sacrificial dune be destroyed by this?
- The adaptation predicted for 2046 - when you consider that the toe will be further forward in the first place and your original prediction was for a 2050 exposure - 2046 is probably going to be too late.
- Why are you doing this in this half-hearted manner? In some ways, you should put the higher coastal defence in from the beginning.

Response: (James Hansen)

- It is important to understand the process we are going through, inevitably there are stages of design which evolve as new information comes in.

- UKCP18 is the climate change allowance approach that was released by the Met Office but it did not come with any guidance and it needed organisations like the Environment Agency to interpret it.
- It came in the middle of what we have been doing and we needed to take it on board.
- We recognise that there will be a future raising of the defence and, you are right, why not go for a greater height in the first place?
- That is exactly how we are viewing it as it makes more sense.
- But with the future raising, all of this is based on good science and its prediction and we use that to drive our design. But this will be driven by the actual sea levels not just our prediction models.
- Rather than having the tallest height now there are lots of good reasons, landscape etc, for setting it at a lower level which seems appropriate.

Reply: (Cllr. Paul Collins)

- It is only a metre in difference so it will not be noticeable.
- Also, most coastal engineers will tell you that covering the rock armour will destroy the value of it because the rock armour is designed to absorb the impact of the waves.
- The covering will not give you any protection and will provide a slope for large waves to travel up.
- I do not accept that you had to wait for UKCP18 to come out to do this. It should be a piece of design that is intrinsic to the first thing you thought about when you considered where to put Sizewell C.

SSSI Crossing

Question: (Cllr. Paul Collins)

- The crossing is not a bridge, it is a wide culvert.
- Your original plans for a two or three pillared bridge were open underneath and did not have all of these issues with very large darkened areas where no habitats will survive and which most of the fauna will not cross as it is too long and too dark.
- The idea that this will drain the SSSI better is actually a danger in its own right. You might find you drain Sizewell marsh and cause problems inside Minsmere south levels because that is where the water will flow rather than dealing with this where there should be no change.

Response: (James Hansen)

- In terms of the water flow, we are working in the background realising that it is causing an effect in Eastbridge.
- We are trying to understand how widening the bridge would decrease that effect. The results are not yet ready to be published.
- I am comfortable and confident it is performing as people would wish as we engage with the Environment Agency amongst others.
- In terms of draining the marshes, we are not affecting the Leiston Drain itself as that will continue to function in the way that it currently does.
- We have been monitoring water levels there for some time and have built a groundwater model in close consultation with the EA and other specialists. It is showing that we are not having undue effects on the water table.

Response: (Alan Lewis)

- The point about whether this is a culvert or a bridge, it is undeniably a bridge as described by our engineering colleagues.
- The width of the bridge in the DCO is 6 metres and the length in a north-south orientation is 30 metres.
- Particularly important, for ecology, is the shortening of the east-west distance to maintain connectivity across the SSSI.
- The culvert was 68 metres long and Natural England and others suggested that it would not provide sufficient connectivity for otters and water voles.
- Changing this to a bridge frees up two areas east and west and the bridge is 47 metres east to west.
- There is good evidence that water voles will happily move through culverts of up to 120 metres so we are very relaxed about them moving under the bridge void which we have narrowed down to 47 metres.
- Otters move through urban areas at night and a width of 47 metres will not prove a barrier to them.
- We are now looking at the ability of different invertebrate groups to cross the Leiston Drain under the bridge.
- The change to the bridge has been particularly well received by the Local Authorities and Natural England.

Reply: (Cllr. Paul Collins)

- Suffolk Wildlife Trust do not agree.
- The slope on the front is much less to the east but you have a 1:1 slope on the rear.
- How do you intend to plant on that slope?

Response: (Alan Lewis)

- With soil stabilisation techniques we might be able to achieve some planting.
- Landscaping will not be needed on the western face because we do not have sensitive use from the west and we will be retaining all the woodland in front of the embankment.

Temporary Beach Landing Facility

Question: (Cllr. Paul Collins)

- Is there any reason why you will not effectively turn this into a jetty for a conveyer?

Response: (Stephen Roach)

- We are looking at various options and we can now get by with a much smaller and more subtle structure.
- The benefits of the platforms is that we don't have more piling than is required as the area is sensitive to underwater noise due to the designation of the North Sea for harbour porpoise and in terms of coastal processes.
- The engineers are still looking at it and there may be some piling elements due to stabilising over the winter period.
- We have ruled out the very long, heavily piled jetty in favour of the BLF to bring in the abnormal indivisible loads.

Community Engagement

Question: (Anne-Marie Robb)

- You have not listened to the community for years otherwise you would not be putting the plans forward that you have done.
- Throughout this evening, we have heard 'we think, maybe, needs to be worked out, continue to refine, are being worked on in detail, we are exploring, evolving, might'.
- This is an issue which will impact our community for the next 15-20 years.
- You cannot get your plans in order when you have had 8 years even before you submitted your DCO application.
- It is very concerning because it means that you will potentially get a DCO and we do not know what you will actually do.
- We have heard from residents at Hinkley that you have a certain number of HGVs approved and then you say you need more.
- Can someone explain why the proposals are constantly changing?

Response: (Tom McGarry)

- Of the EDF people here, I have been on the project the longest.
- There is a lot of frustration and I have been in a lot of meetings with lots of you.
- I think there are lots of areas where we demonstrated we have listened.
- If you look at the plans over the four stages of consultation, there have been significant changes.
- One example is that the B1122 is not proposed to be used for deliveries but when we suggested the Sizewell Link Road and the Theberton By-Pass there were disagreements over the route and a preference for another one.
- We have to balance a lot of elements and other feedback in terms of trying to find proposals that can be as acceptable as possible.
- We stand by what we have submitted in the DCO application, but this does not mean that the listening stops and that we stop responding to it.
- An example of this is working harder on the 60% road deliveries. There will be a number of Town and Parish Councils, as well as the Local Authorities, who may raise a statutory objection to this which is significant issue during the examination process. Therefore we are looking at it and representing you in terms of your feedback.
- These changes do not demonstrate that the DCO application was not finished - the changes are trying to meet your aspirations.

Question: (Marianne Fellowes)

- It is interesting the changes you are proposing because many of them are not what stakeholders, the local people, want.
- We would all like less vehicles on the roads but perhaps you need to look at building only one reactor or changing the location of the accommodation block or changing where the SLR is.
- The consultation document admits that you do not know the capacity of the freight transport.
- Is this a Rochdale Envelope approach?
- There is not any real information or credibility to these proposals and we do not believe they will bring the benefits that you say they will.
- It is obvious you are just trying to appease the Local Authorities.

Response: (Richard Bull)

- The table in the consultation documents gives an accurate representation of the thresholds.

- With regard to rail, previously we have said that each train will be equivalent to 50 vehicles a day or a 100 movements but, following consultations with our supply chain, it is more relevant to base those calculations on a rigid vehicle with less capacity.
- We now think 135 two-way movements as opposed to 100 two-way movements.
- We are presenting a more robust calculation taking into account that there may be more movements because of smaller HGVs.

Construction Phase

Question: (David Grant)

- The construction phase will take 9-12 years.
- Why is there a 30% variance when EDF have never completed an EPR?

Response: (Tom McGarry)

- The answer is Taishan. We built it in partnership with CGN.
- Every country has different regulatory systems.
- We are on schedule at Hinkley Point C.
- The schedule that was announced indicated that there was additional investment in HPC to try to ensure that we bear down on any risks to the schedule.
- All of the construction milestones have been met to date.

The Chairman thanked Tom McGarry and his team for attending the meeting and for answering questions. He reminded everyone that they have the right to reply to the proposals and urged everyone to keep writing to EDF and the Planning Inspectorate if they are not happy. The EDF representatives and most of the members of the public left the meeting at this point.

4. Energy Projects

- a) Cllr. Paul Collins summarised his previously circulated report, attached as Appendix I.
- b) The Council agreed to approve the Council's response to the EDF Energy Sizewell C fifth public consultation by email by 17th December 2020.

5. Date and Time of Next Meeting

The Council confirmed the date and time of the next meeting of the Council which is scheduled for Wednesday 13th January 2021 at 7:00 pm.

The meeting closed at 9:30 pm.

Appendix I – Energy Projects

1 TEAGS – Stop Sizewell C

Work continues on national awareness and campaigning. Our Facebook petition has now surpassed 19,500 signatures. The petition is still open and accessible at www.stopsizewellpetition.com.

The ten-point plan for meeting our net zero commitments has been announced, but with little detail. £525m has been allocated to new nuclear, fusion, SMR and AMR research and development, some of which had already been announced previously. After the amount already announced for SMRs and AMRs and fusion is removed the balance is not significant when considering the cost of a project like SZC, currently estimated at £20bn. HPC is currently estimated to cost £22.5bn overall, although the project is a long way from being able to be confident that this latest total will be achieved, especially given other EPR cost and schedule overruns at Flamanville and Olkiluoto.

The National Infrastructure Strategy was published on 25th November and government support for large-scale nuclear was repeated, “*subject to value for money*”, this is a meaningless statement without specific financing proposals.

We still await the publication of the new Energy Whitepaper mooted to be published before the end of the year.

By the time we meet, we understand the UK Committee on Climate Change will have published its latest carbon assessment and carbon budget proposals which will also indicate various strategies for meeting net zero 2050 along with the risks and likelihood of the various strategies being successful.

On Friday 4th December Alison and I hosted a walk from Kenton Hills car park to the tank traps at the coast with Cllr Craig Rivett (ESC) and Cllr Richard Rout (SCC) accompanied by Ben McFarland (SWT) and Adam Rowlands (RSPB). Despite the inclement weather, the councillors appreciated the stroll through the construction site as prior visits were mainly to the SZC platform next to SZB and this gave a better opportunity to understand the impact of the development on the area and its habitats as well as a better feel for the extent of the site and the impact of the Hard Coastal Defence and Beach Landing Facility at the coast. Ben and Adam were able to explain how the main habitat, fauna and flora impacts related to both Sizewell Marsh and Minsmere.

On Monday 7th December we hosted a zoom briefing on the fifth EDF Consultation and over 60 people were able to join the meeting despite some issues with Zoom changing a password and the Eventbrite booking system not updating people who had booked early. A video of the session is available on YouTube at [Stop Sizewell C Consultation 5 Briefing](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=...). Further information about the consultation and how to respond is available on the Stop Sizewell C website at <https://stopsizewellc.org/core/wp-content/uploads/2020/12/Public-Briefing-5th-Consultations.pdf>

A number of media articles have been published and we continue to encourage press, TV and radio coverage as far as we are able to do so. Andy Wood from Adnams wrote about long term employment generation alternatives to SZC in EADT at <https://www.eadt.co.uk/news/opinion-andy-wood-adnams-sizewell-power-plant-1-6950551>.

Sadly, felling in Coronation Wood has now started and a number of groups are trying to engage with local media to publicise its loss.

Our next meeting is scheduled for 14th December.

2 T&E Parish Council

Our objection to the latest SZB Relocation Hybrid Planning Application has been submitted.

3 Scottish Power DCO Examination

A new consultation on additional land required for the project has been started by Scottish Power. The land required is all extensions and widening of existing proposed compulsory purchase land for access to various construction sites or cable routes.

In my opinion there are no grounds for the Parish Council to engage with this consultation as none of the land is within the Parish or will have any impact on the Parish or residents.